DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 439 EA 008 824

AUTHOR Meyers, Russell W.
TITLE The Imperative of Leadership I. A Report of Educational Governance.
INSTITUTION National Association of State Boards of Education, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of State Agency Cooperation.; New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 17p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of State Boards of Education, 810 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295 ($1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Role; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Governance; Governing Boards; *Political Power; *State Boards of Education; State School District Relationship

ABSTRACT

This booklet is one of a series of reports addressing the most critical issues confronting state boards of education throughout the United States. Each report attempts to present a concise, informative review and analysis of the best and most current information available on one of these critical topics. This booklet focuses on state governance of education and more specifically, on the role of the state board in educational governance. Section 1 contains a brief overview and summary of the booklet; section 2 presents a review and analysis of educational governance by Russell W. Meyers; section 3 presents a number of action alternatives for state boards recommended by the staff of the National Association of State Boards of Education; and section 4 contains footnotes and a brief annotated bibliography prepared by the author of section 2. (Author/JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED130439

THE IMPERATIVE OF LEADERSHIP

I

A REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

EA 008 824

NASBE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE 3
SECTION I OVERVIEW SUMMARY 5
SECTION II EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE ... 7
SECTION III ACTION ALTERNATIVES 14
SECTION IV APPENDIX 15

PREFACE

I. PURPOSES AND PROCEDURES OF THE PROJECT

During the next 18 months, NASBE will publish 12 reports addressing the 12 most critical issues confronting state boards of education throughout the nation. These studies will summarize the current state of the art including identification of the controversies surrounding the issues.

To date only topics for the first six reports have been identified. The research tool utilized was a needs assessment survey conducted on a representative sample of state board of education members during NASBE's Training Workshop in Wilmington, Delaware in February 1975. The six most critical issues which emerged are enumerated (in order of publication) below:

- Educational Governance Relative to:
  1. Collective Bargaining
  2. Citizen Involvement
  3. Local Board vs. State Board Control
  4. Legislature as a Super Board
- Developing Equitable School Finance Methods.
- Strengthening and Improving Relationships between State Boards and Legislatures.
- Assessment/Accountability
- Planning, Improvement and Governance of Vocational and Vocational Technical Education, with particular attention to K-12 and Post-Secondary Interface Relationships with other Governing Boards.
- Problems Relative to the Education of Disadvantaged Migrants, the Poor and Minorities.

If the old adage "information is power" is correct, then the more useful information NASBE provides state board of education members, the more influential and effective they can become in their roles as state educational policy makers. This is the thrust and guiding principle behind issuance of these reports.

II. SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

These six reports cannot be considered totally definitive. But they are the first step in analyzing what is a very imperfect art. In undertaking this project NASBE has sought a cogent, concise and informative review of the best and most current data available. Contacts with many professionals knowledgeable in these fields were made to garner their insights and expertise and to develop models for use by state board members.

In instances where research is definitive that information has been presented. In cases where it is still speculative this also has been noted. NASBE has been fortunate to retain professionals who have been unafraid at times to step outside their areas of expertise to recommend or advise possible alternative actions.

III. ORGANIZATION OF GOVERNANCE REPORT

The first report on *Educational Governance* is organized into four sections. Section I contains an Overview Summary on *Educational Governance*. Section II is the complete research text — *Educational Governance*. Section III presents Action Alternatives. Section IV is the Appendix containing Footnotes to Section II and an Annotated Bibliography.

This organizational format was chosen to meet the needs of several types of readers. The Overview Summary is intended for the reader who is concerned with the subject but for various reasons does not wish to be burdened with detail. Sections II through IV (containing research text, pragmatic alternatives and review sources) are provided for the technical reader who wishes an indepth study of the topic.

IV. CONCLUSION

We believe these six reports represent a first in several ways. First, we have assembled the most current available data on these issues from a group of recognized experts knowledgeable in the field. Secondly, this is the first time the critical issues confronting state boards have been identified by a needs assessment survey and then disseminated in information packets to all members. Finally, the assessments and recommendations represent the most recent alternatives available in the field.

NASBE wishes to express appreciation to the Center for Research and Education (CRE) in Denver who coordinated the research efforts and to Dr. Russell W. Meyers, associate professor of education at the University of Colorado, who authored the research text on *Educational Governance*, (Section II).

We believe that the successful implementation of a viable governance structure for a state board of education is one of the most critical, but often neglected, aspects of its operations. As this report demonstrates, there is much yet to be done.

Robert H. McBride
NASBE President

OVERVIEW SUMMARY

Lay, rather than professional, control of education is a valued position in governance. State Boards of Education are the legitimate representative of lay citizen control at the state level.

Two basic postures for State Boards are suggested:

- Authority based on the use of political power
- Authority based on the exercise of professional/expert leadership, a blue ribbon or statesman role.

In determining what direction to take, each State Board must assess its own potential political strength in the State's hierarchy, its ability to influence the Chief State School Officer and the state education agency, and the quality of its relationships with the local school boards. This assessment must then be weighed against its answers to several value questions: Should the State Board be an autonomous advocate for education, or a legitimate part of the State political system? ... an aggressive leader setting "ideal" policies for the State as a whole, or one that seeks to represent many interests? ... a supervisor of administration, or a policy formulation body?

The following checklists summarize the factors to be taken into consideration:

The posture of political power is enhanced when:

- State Board members are elected.
- State Board members see themselves in a political process where exercise of political power and authority are the way to get things done.
- The state constitution defines a position of authority for the State Board.
- The Chief State School Officer works under the authority of the State Board.
- The Chief is professionally competent and disposed to using his influence in the political arena.
- The State Board has its own staff to aid them in their work so attention can be given to policy coordination.

The posture of statesman or professional leadership is enhanced when:

- State Board members' disposition is to be above the political wars.
- State Board members have a high level of expertise and see themselves as professionals.
- State Board members are see by others as professionals.
- The Chief State School Officer and staff of the state education agency are professionally competent.
- State Board members have a positive relationship with the Chief, thereby assuring access to information and specialized expertise in educational matters.

The following checklists summarize the various strategies that might be used in implementing whatever role the State Board chooses to adopt. In no order of priority, some or all may be appropriate in any given situation.

Means for Exercising the Political Role:

- In-depth public participation in policy formulation.
- Accessibility by political activists to the State Board through formal (hearings, workshops, etc.) and non-formal (lobby) mechanisms.
- Use of the Chief State School Officer to influence the political policy decisions of the governor and state legislature.
- Use of the Chief State School Officer to influence the local boards and administrators in implementing the policies, with the State Board monitoring the kinds of power exerted.
- Liaison committee with broad representation from state associations of local boards and administrators, with guidelines for participation.
- Special education commission with representatives of major state political powers to work with State Board and state education agency in shaping policies and advocating them to legislature, governor, and local boards.
- Assistance of a small staff, to free the State Board for a coordinating role.

Means for Exercising the Statesman Role:

- Relative insulation from public pressures in policy formation.

- Continuing broad-based, but structured, lay committee to assist State Board and state education agency in their statesman/leadership roles.
- Small formal liaison committee with representation from state associations of local boards and administrators to reduce local/state board conflict.
- Use of Chief State School Officer as advocate for State Board positions on policy.
- Speaking to proposed legislative actions from the statesman's "best interests of education" position.

Means for Exercising Any Role Chosen:

- Carefully building a good working relationship with the Chief State School Officer.
- Insuring professional competence of the Chief and staff of the state education agency.
- Input from citizens in policy formation.
- Liaison with local boards and administrators.
- Liaison with governor and legislature.

These are difficult, demanding times for the State Board of Education. Realistic assessment of its strengths and weaknesses, adaptability, reallocation of resources, elimination of some responsibilities, and deliberate emphasis on extension of control are all possible. They are also necessary if the role of the State Board in the governance of education is to be made more influential.

EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

Dr. Russell W. Meyers
Associate Professor of Education
University of Colorado

Introduction

The basic issue in educational governance is determining "*who* should have *how much* of *what kinds* of authority and power"[1] in setting policy for schools in the state. (Governance in this sense is concerned with making policy rather than with administering it.) This paper is concerned with state governance of education and, more specifically, with the role of the State Board of Education in that governance.

Two postures are proposed for this role — authority through political power and authority through professional leadership. These are discussed in terms of the structure of the State Board within the state's hierarchy, especially its relationship to the Chief State School Officer, and the basic value questions each State Board must answer. Finally, these roles are examined within the context of several specific issues that impinge on the effectiveness of the State Board in performing governance functions: (1) local and state board relationships, (2) the state legislature as a super board, (3) citizen involvement, and (4) collective bargaining.

State Governance of Education

The legal basis of the state's primacy in educational decision making is no longer seriously challenged; state governmental structures have almost total authority. Five structures can be identified as potential wielders of power in setting policy for schools: the governor's office, the state legislature, the state education agency, the state board of education, and the local school board. The first four participate in policy making through formally established processes, while the local boards tend to be limited to influencing policy either prior to enactment or in the process of administration of policy.

Governors, as the chief executive officers, are concerned with educational policies as part of their total responsibilities. Legislators are intimately involved with financing education and with the formal enactment of major educational legislation. Therefore, both view education as a legitimate area of responsibility to the state. Both also can claim political power to support their educational policy positions on the basis of their election by a broadly based constituency.

The state education agencies look to other sources to legitimize their claims to authority and power. They represent the one state governmental structure concerned primarily with education. This permits them a degree of specialization impossible either in the governor's office or in the legislature. Specialization tends to enhance power based on expertise and access to knowledge.

In some states, where state board of education emmbers are elected, they too can claim some power on the basis of election. This claim is limited, however, by the relatively little interest shown in state board elections, a general lack of information about board members, and perhaps by the method of selection of candidates for these positions.

The Role of the State Board of Education (SBE)

Variations among the 50 states make generalizing difficult. Primary interest here, however, is with the SBE's role in the governance of education and with how that role might be made more influential. It must be recognized, however, that separation of the State Board from the state education agency in this respect is not possible, for in many states the power and authority of the SBE appears to be related to the nature of the interaction between it and the Chief State School Officer.

According to the recent Campbell and Mazzoni study,[2] less than one third (15) of the State Boards are elected, 32 are appointed, and two are composed of ex-officio members from other departments of the state government. One state does not have a State Board of Education. About half of all state Board members have had some professional experience in education;[3] these members may be more inclined to see their role as a professional rather than political position. Most State Boards function as non-salaried, part-time governmental bodies, with members investing from four to six days per month in SBE affairs.[4] In addition, most function without a full time staff other than that made available through the state education agency. The extent to

which these conditions exist in a particular state probably limits the ability of that State Board to exert constant and organized influence on the educational-making processes. This is not to say that State Boards are powerless, only that they are in a relatively less favorable power position than either the governor's office or the legislature.

The advantages the State Board does have are its singular focus on education, the professional stature of the Chief State School Officer, and the information base which the state education agency can provide. The SBE can work with and through the Chief to influence the political policy decisions of the governor and the legislature. A number of Chief State School Officers are indeed influential in legislative deliberations. State Boards probably can influence education policy to the extent to which they in fact determine or influence the policy positions the Chiefs advocate. As uncomfortable as it may be, it appears that the SBE's power in policy formulation is tied directly to the professional ability and the political sophistication of the Chief State School Officer. Therefore, the method of selecting the Chief State School Officer has implications for the role of the State Board of Education.

In summary, then, the question of *who* should have power can be answered in several ways — the governor, the legislature, the Chief State School Officer, and the SBE. All four have some claim to power and authority in educational policy making. Less clear answers are found, though, when the question is *how much* power should be vested in each. It is probably safe to assume that each is inclined to answer, "As much as the system allows."

Structure — and Power

It is suggested that two kinds of power can be brought to bear in educational policy making — political power and that based on professional/expert authority. Given the basic differences in selection of both State Boards and Chief State School Officers, and the varied relationships State Boards have with governors and legislatures, no single power model is applicable to all states. Granted that the SBE inherently has less political power than either the governor or legislature, a range of political power may be available depending on the legal structure of the state. Structure itself does not generate political power, but it provides opportunities for generating it.

Table 1 suggests degrees to which structure is conducive to the exercise of *political* power. This model is based on two assumptions:

- Elected SBE members are potentially more influential in political decisions than appointed officials. This advantage comes from election by a constituency shared in part by elected governors and legislators.
- The more authority over and influence on the Chief State School Officers available to the SBE, the greater the possibility of influencing the political process. This acknowledges the key position of the Chief in helping shape the governor's and the legislature's educational policy positions.

TABLE 1 — POLITICAL POWER POTENTIAL OF THE SBE

Political Power Potential	*Power Position*	*State Board of Education*	*Chief State School Officer*
High	1	Elected, term concurrent with that of governor	Appointed by, and serves at discretion of, the SBE
	2	Elected for staggered, overlapping terms	
	3	Appointed by governor with approval of legislature	
	4	Appointed for long, overlapping terms	
	5	Elected, term concurrent with that of governor	Elected, not subject to removal by the SBE
	6	Elected for staggered, overlapping terms	
	7	Appointed by governor with approval of legislature	
Low	8	Appointed for long, overlapping terms	

The personality, ability, and disposition of the State Board members and of the Chief, the history of relationships within a particular state, the degree of conflict about education, as well as a number of other factors, also determine the political power available to the SBE.

Some states do provide State Boards the structural conditions that permit degrees of active political involvement with some likelihood of influencing educational policy making. Others seem to operate with relatively little political power potential available to the SBE. In such cases, another avenue for exerting influence on policy making must be sought: reliance on the authority of specialization, professional expertise, and access to information. Table 2 suggests degrees of *professional* authority which structural arrangements within a state lend to the SBE. Several basic assumptions also underlie assessment of the professional authority available:

- Professional authority and the testimony of experts do influence public policy formation.
- Removal from direct political activity enhances the professional authority base. The further an SBE is removed from direct political activity in the selection process, the greater the tendency to attribute professional authority to it.
- The SBE tends to have some influence on the Chief State School Officer, regardless of method of selection of the latter.

Both Tables 1 and 2 are concerned primarily with the structure under which the State Boards function. Again, structure alone cannot dictate direction for SBE members, but it can provide a base for discussion as to leadership directions a Board may wish to take. The professional competence of the Chief State School Officer, and his inclination to act politically, are of course as important as structure in determining the most useful approach.

TABLE 2 — PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY POTENTIAL OF THE SBE

Authority Potential	*Power Position*	*State Board of Education*	*Chief State School Officer*
High	1	Appointed for long, overlapping terms	Appointed by, and serves at discretion of, the SBE
	2	Appointed by governor with approval of legislature	
	3	Appointed for long, overlapping terms	Elected, not subject to removal by SBE
	4	Appointed by governor with approval of legislature	
	5	Elected for staggered, overlapping terms	Appointed by, and serves at discretion of, the SBE
	6		Elected, not subject to removal by the SBE
	7	Elected, term concurrent with that of governor	Appointed by, and serves at discretion of, the SBE
	8		Elected, not subject to removal by the SBE

Value Questions

The educational leadership role the State Board chooses for itself is determined in large part by how it answers vatious basic value questions, such as:[5]

- Is education a legitimate part of politics, or should it be separated from politics as much as possible?
- Should the SBE conceive its role as an autonomous advocate for education, apart from the political processes, or as a part of the total state governmental structure concerned with education?
- Should the SBE see its relationship with its constituents as that of an aggressive leader helping to set "ideal" educational policies, or as a representative body seeking to formulate policies that represent the educational interests of its many publics?

- Should the SBE's primary responsibility be that of supervising the administration of education through its governing relationship with the Chief State School Officer, or only as a policy formulation body for the state as a whole?

No single "right" answer is possible in value areas; each SBE must resolve such questions for itself and proceed accordingly.

Some of these may be in conflict. For example, there is some evidence that broad involvement of citizens and particular interest groups make it difficult for the SBE to propose needed, forward-looking policies. Relative insulation from public pressures may be essential for those State Boards seeking to exercise the autonomous, professional leadership role. Conversely, State Boards pursuing an active political role at the state level probably require a broadly based support which can come only through in-depth participation in the policy formulation state. This may result in compromises rather than in forward-looking policies.

There is no single recommended role for all State Boards of Education. Selection of that role is largely a matter of how a particular SBE answers the value questions and of the extent to which structure permits it to function either politically or professionally.

Two Environmental Realities

Two national trends hold immediate implications for State Boards of Education:

- The tendency to resolve all social issues, including educational ones, through direct political actions
- The transfer to the state of increasing responsibility for financing education.

Both thrust increased responsibility on the state legislature, making education of major concern there.

Political activists, with interest in a particular educational policy, are apt to bypass the SBE and go directly to individual legislators. They see this as a more direct, efficient way to gain their ends. The political nature of the legislative process permits and encourages access to legislators, lobbying, responsiveness to organized groups, and advocacy of specific positions by an individual legislator. State Boards, on the other hand, by their nature are not prepared to meet these political activities, and many State Board members see them as harmful to decision making in education. Direct political action has become a respectable activity, however, and the legislature as the more politically accessible body is the logical target for such activity.

Similarly, the push for the state to provide a larger share of the money for education at the local level (and ultimately for full state funding) has forced the legislatures to become increasingly concerned with education. There is a limited amount of money available to support all state services, of which education is but one. Competition for state money, then, cannot help but force individual legislators to become more deeply involved with educational policies. Professional educators and interested citizens may advocate educational programs which are simply "too rich" for the state, and legislators may be more willing than professionals to make decisions as to how the educational finance load can be reduced. This is particularly true where professional groups feel they simply cannot compromise "quality education for the state."

For the immediate future, then, state legislatures can be expected to move toward more rather than less direct decision making in education.

Issues Facing State Boards of Education

Earlier, four issues facing the SBE were identified. Two of these — local/state board relationships and the legislature as a super board — are concerned with the SBE's middle position in state government. The third, citizen involvement, is a challenge to the State Board to assume the role of a representative body in policy making. The fourth, negotiations, is a "hot" political issue having direct implications for State Boards. These four issues are interrelated.

Relationships with the Local Board

Two questions have impact on local school districts. They have to do with the persistent issue of local vs. state control of education, which is administered largely at the local level, and with the manner in which the State Board functions. Is the emphasis on attaining specified minimum educational standards, thus casting the SBE in a regulatory role? Or is the SBE concerned with helping local districts attain maximum level programs in individual districts, with the accompanying variance in educational quality throughout the state?

The potential for local/state board conflict is a fact of life. Statewide interests

nearly always conflict with some local values and interests. In finance, for example, attempts to equalize expenditures among districts may be seen as repressive by small, wealthy districts with a low tax rate — penalizing those districts wanting to expand educational offerings. Efforts on the part of the State Board and the state education agency to secure necessary information may be viewed as excess bureaucracy and interference on the part of the State.

The State Board can take some steps to avoid overt conflict with local boards and local administrators. Working through the Chief State School Officer, it can establish a formal liaison committee composed of representatives of the state association of local boards of education and the professional administrators association. Some states now have such committees. If the membership of the committee is kept relatively small, and if important contemplated policy issues or regulations are presented to the committee for discussion before promulgation, the SBE may be able to garner broadly based support and understanding of its positions. At the least, particular sources of local/state board conflict should become obvious, and steps can be taken either to minimize the conflict or to plan a strategy that will allow the SBE positions to prevail.

Two questions arise in establishing such a formal liaison committee. Is it representative enough? How can it be kept in the liaison/advisory role?

If the concern is with *participation of all interested groups*, the composition recommended above is not representative enough. On the other hand, if the primary interest is *reducing local/state board conflict*, it is adequate. Some would argue that the state teachers association should also be represented. Much of the SBE conflict with local districts, however, is with the local boards and with administrators who must work with the regulations governing policy. Teachers are less directly involved. Including teacher representatives might be possible in states where the collective negotiations movement has not yet separated administrators and teachers into warring camps, or where there is a single teachers organization. But where teacher-administrator conflict is high, or where both National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers affiliates are seriously contesting for negotiations supremacy, teacher representation on the liaison committee might prove disastrous. Thus, a good case can be made for a small (9-10 member) liaison committee composed of SBE, local administrator, and local board representatives, and for allowing that committee to deal with issues of substance.

Keeping an advisory committee in the advisory capacity is never easy. Members are willing to serve on such committees only to the extent they feel the committee serves a useful purpose. Carefully written, mutually developed guidelines, however, can work to keep the committee within its functions. The SBE can retain responsibility for chairing the committee. It can also make certain that proposed policies and regulations are brought to the committee at a time when discussion can be fruitful. Bringing established regulations and policies to local administrator and board representatives only for the purposes of a rubber stamp is not likely to reduce conflict with local interests.

At the same time, the SBE must be prepared to deal with rising expectations of such a committee. If the groups represented find the committee is responsive and does in fact influence education policies, efforts may be exerted to gain further influence. Thus, the guidelines must contain agreement on how far the committee can go in cooperatively working out policies and regulations that reflect both state and local concerns. There may be some areas where the State's interests cannot be compromised and where conflict is unavoidable, but even here the committee can foster some degree of understanding of the issues.

Once policy has been formulated, the state education agency and its Chief have primary responsibility for implementation and administration. Although state power needs to be exerted in administering policy, the question is "What *kind* of power?"

Colton defined power as "any resource which can be used to influence the decisions of others."[6] He also defined five kinds of power available to state education agencies: reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert. Depending on the policy to be implemented, State Boards can insist that the state education agencies rely primarily on expert power and on referent power. Expert power, of course, should be found within the agency itself. Referent power results when local district personnel become identified with and are involved in implementing state education policies. Coercive power may be required on occasion and in particular districts; however, it carries with it high risk of negative reaction and of the use of political pressures against the state agencies. Therefore, the SBE should monitor the kinds of power the state education agency tends to exert on local districts.

State Legislature as Super Board

As mentioned earlier, state legislatures can be expected to exercise more rather than less direct decision making in education -- tending to become super boards. Recent New York legislation reducing the length of the terms of the powerful Board of Regents can be interpreted as an effort to exercise greater control over education policies.

If a state legislature determines that it will exercise many of the prerogatives traditionally assigned to the State Board of Education, it probably can — except in those states where the SBE's responsibilities are established in the constitution. State Boards are not in a position to contest directly with the legislature in terms of political power. But neither are they totally helpless.

One source of strength available to the SBE is the state education agency. In its role as the governing body for the state education agency, the SBE can insist on high levels of professionalism in the recruitment of its personnel and in its administration. The fairly common and documented view of some state departments of education as havens for retiring superintendents from small rural districts does not enhance the reputation of the department either in the legislature or with professional educators. Hopefully, this is a declining view. State Boards must take aggressive roles in assuring that the departments of education function at the upper limits of professionalism.

The SBE can also take the lead in seeking legislative establishment of a highly integrated, state-level commission concerned with education. The now defunct Illinois School Problems Commission might serve as an example. When that Commission was operating, Illinois did not have an SBE. There is no reason, however, that a similar commission could not operate with and through an SBE. The Illinois School Problems Commission included in its membership "legislators, gubernatorial appointees, an elected state official, and representatives of organized interest groups."[7] The elected official was the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

A similar commission, with or without representatives of special interest groups, would provide the State Board with a forum in which to exert considerable influence on the legislative program. All legitimate actors at the state level would be represented; education would be its primary concern. The professional interests and expertise of the State Board could thereby be integrated into the shaping of policies for submission to the legislature. In addition, it would have the advantage of knowledgeable and dedicated advocates of those policies in the legislature's deliberations.

The question of including special interest groups must be faced. Decisions about such representation will probably reflect the values attached to public policy making by legally selected state officials. No doubt the prestige and influence of SBE members on such committees would be greater if special interest groups were excluded.

Such a commission would not assure that the legislature would not function as the super board, but it *would* assure aggressive SBE input when the legislature did act in that capacity.

A major question to be resolved is: Can the State Board, composed of non-salaried members serving four to six days per month, become involved with both a state-level commission and a local liaison committee and still exercise its responsibilities for the state department of education? To do so, certainly, the SBE would need a small staff of its own to allow its members to reallocate their time and abilities into these expanded policy coordination activities.

Citizen Involvement

How a particular State Board perceives its role probably dictates the extent to which there is lay citizen involvement in its deliberations. An SBE that sees itself primarily as representing specific sub-publics, with responsibility for working toward educational policies which reflect the interests and values of these groups, must provide multiple opportunities for citizen input.

There are other views of the SBE role, however. Morrisett charged the SBE with responsibility for providing "enlightened, forward-looking leadership and educational statesmanship."[8] The State Board he recommended would be a "blue ribbon board" — one composed of men and women who are non-partisan, above politics, and dedicated to the public welfare. He also recommended a "continuing, broadly based lay committee" to assist the SBE and the state education agency in their statesmanship roles.

Morrisett's continuing lay committee and open access to the SBE by multiple interest groups are at opposite ends of citizen involvement. State Boards that opt for the more political role may find that the broad, open-access approach to citizens is most helpful. Well-advertised public hearings, accompanied by invitations to establish in-

terest groups, may serve them better than a continuing, structured lay advisory group. This puts the SBE in a sounding board position, and would seem particularly appropriate for elected State Boards interested in maintaining maximum contact with constituents.

On the other hand, the lay advisory committee appears more appropriate for State boards seeking the professional/expert authority way of leadership. The major question facing such State Boards may be that of representation. The SBE must be more than an organ for professional education groups and the local school boards association if the state as a whole is to be represented.

As discussed under Relationships with the Local Board, a liaison advisory committee of only administrator and local school board representatives was suggested for the purpose of reducing local/state board conflict. A broader based committee is necessary, however, if the goal is to increase citizen participation. There are obvious limits to the number of formal intra-governmental relationships a State Board can manage. Thus the choice facing the SBE here — a matter of priorities — would seem to be between an advisory committee to minimize local/state board conflict and one to maximize citizen involvement. It is unlikely that a single committee could do both.

Negotiations

Collective bargaining in education is or will shortly become a major political issue. Some states have enacted collective negotiation legislation, and in others such legislation has been introduced. This is a volatile issue, one that divides professional educators as well as citizens in general. To what extent is it a political rather than an educational issue? There is no doubt that collective negotiation is of direct concern to local district boards, administrators, and teachers. Shaping the content of the professional negotiation legislation is being vigorously contested politically in the legislature. What role should the State Board play in shaping collective negotiation laws?

A strong case can be made for a neutral but interested observer position. First, the State Board is in a weaker political power position than the state teachers organization, the local school boards association, or the administrators organization. These groups can mount organized campaigns to pressure individual legislators to support their positions. State Boards do not have the mechanism to do this. Second, State Boards are probably in a "no-win" situation should they take a strong political position about a piece of negotiation legislation. Such a position, regardless of how carefully established, would probably be viewed as anti-teacher, anti-administrator, or anti-local board. The SBE leadership role is tenuous, and relies somewhat on the willingness of various educational groups to accept it as broadly and sincerely interested in education. The coalition of professional groups has undergone strain, and negotiations will subject it to further stress. If the SBE is viewed by any one of the major contestants as favoring another, its position in future educational policy making is seriously damaged.

State Boards need not sit on their hands, however. The statesmanship position — the objective voice of the state's education interests — can be filled and neutrality still maintained. There is an obligation to testify regarding perceived impact on education of the legislation under consideration. The SBE must forcefully insist that the legislation (1) provide for fair, efficient, quick conflict resolution; (2) does not penalize either party in its ability to negotiate from a position of strength; and (3) attempt to clarify what is negotiable. The SBE can speak on behalf of the State's interests without becoming a partisan advocate of a specific piece of negotiation legislation.

Currently, negotiations take place primarily at the local district level. Over time, the legislature may be seen as the most potent political force to be reckoned with, and thus negotiations may move from the local to the state level. Should that happen, State Boards will be more directly involved and may be denied the neutral observer position. Until that time, however, State Boards may best retain influence on education policy making by limited involvement in shaping negotiation legislation.

ACTION ALTERNATIVES

NASBE Staff Recommendations to State Boards

We believe that by and large Dr. Meyer's analysis is accurate and that his recommendations are sound. What follows are the recommendations of your headquarters staff. These recommendations outline a course of action which seems to us to be both logical and feasible.

1. The board should direct the chief or an outside consulting firm to conduct a survey of a sample of the executive, the legislature, educational leaders, businessmen, local board members and parents. (Our bias is toward public opinion research firms as opposed to mailed surveys). The purpose of this survey would be (1) to determine the attitudes of these groups toward the state board and the SEA; (2) to determine their perceptions of board and SEA effectiveness; (3) to seek their suggestions for improvement; and (4) to ascertain their view as to whether the board should function as a political force or in a statesmanship capacity.
2. At the same time, the board, the chief, and the chief's key deputies, should collectively review their perceptions of the board's and the SEA's effectiveness utilizing either a technique known as The Management Responsibility Guide or an adaptation thereof. (Available through NASBE).
3. Information from one and two above should be carefully reviewed. From that analysis the board should
   (a) Reach consensus among themselves and with the chief regarding their authority posture, i.e., the use of political power, the exercise of a statesman role or a mix thereof. This consensus should be reached after an honest appraisal of (1) the board's and chief's selection processes, (2) your past performance as policy making and influencing bodies, (3) the willingness to systematically and jointly select strategies to exercise your roles.
   (b) Prioritize the areas of identified weakness and jointly with the chief develop strategies and work plans to systematically eliminate the weaknesses.
   (c) Hold a work session(s) with the chief to reach an understanding regarding
      (1) The board's role in policy development
      (2) The chief's role in policy development
      (3) The board's role in administration
      (4) The chief's role in administration
      (5) The process which will be followed in policy development, including the development of policy alternatives for board review.
   (d) Determine the specific strategies which the board and chief will use to
      (1) Insure timely citizen involvement
      (2) Insure timely input from school superintendents and local boards
      (3) Maximize your collective influence over the legislative process.
4. All strategies developed in three and four above, should be reduced to work plans which clearly identify the activities to be carried out, identify the individual responsible, establish the completion date for each activity, and establish the number, kind and dates of progress reports to the board.

NASBE's headquarters staff stands ready to assist and advise any board and chief who desires our assistance. We cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of Board/Chief/SEA teamwork. Teamwork comes however only after the key actors clearly understand their roles and the roles of others, the work process to be followed, and the reporting mechanisms to be used. Finally and perhaps most importantly, teamwork requires constant effort, open dialogue between the key actors, and mutual respect.

APPENDIX

Footnotes

[1] Shelly Weinstein and Douglas E. Mitchell, "In Education Policy Making, Nearly Everyone is Frustrated," *Compact* IX (February 1975), p. 3.

[2] Roald F. Campbell and Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr., *State Governance Models for the Public Schools*, prepared for the Educational Governance Project, The Ohio State University, August 1974 (ERIC Document: ED 094-483), p. 13.

[3] Ibid, p. 16.

[4] Ibid, p. 121.

[5] (Adapted from) Ibid, p. 111.

[6] David L. Colton, "State Power and Local Decision-Making," in *Strengthening State Department of Education*, ed. Roald F. Campbell, Gerald E. Stroufe, and Donald H. Layton (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1976), p. 45.

[7] Nicholas A. Master, Robert H. Salisbury, and Thomas H. Eliot, *State Politics and the Public schools* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), p. 125.

[8] Lloyd N. Morrisett, Sr., "Change and Development in State Departments of Education," in *Seven Cruical Issues in Education: Alternatives for State Action* (Denver: Education Commission of the States May 7-9, 1976), p. 6.

*Annotated Bibliography**

Campbell, Roald F., and Mazonni, Tim L., Jr. *State Governance Models for the Public Schools.* Prepared for the Educational Governance Project, Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, August, 1974. (ERIC Document: ED 094-483)

Probably the most comprehensive study available of the structural arrangements of State Boards of Education. There is a companion volume available which deals with the ten states which were analyzed in depth. In addition to the superior analysis of structure and the effects of structure on State Board functioning, the study contains recommendations for consideration. Undoubtedly the most helpful source currently available in understanding the role of State Boards of Education, State Departments of Education, and the Chief State School Officer.

Colton, David L., "State Power and Local Decision-Making." *Strengthening State Departments of Education.* Edited by Roald F. Campbell, Gerald E. Stroufe, and Donald H. Layton. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1967.

The Colton chapter deals specifically with State Department of Education's ability to "bring about local compliance with state policies." The monograph itself is an earlier effort to aid State Education Agencies to improve their functioning in governing education, and includes a chapter on recommendations.

Master, Nicholas A.; Salisbury, Robert H.; and Eliot, Thomas H. *Politics and the Public Schools.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964.

Basically a study of the politics of education in three states: Illinois, Missouri, and Michigan. The study is now dated and probably is of limited usefulness to State Board of Education members.

Morrisett, Lloyd W., Sr. "Change and Development in State Departments of Education." *Seven Crucial Issues in Education: Alternative for State Action.* Denver: Education Commission of the States, May 7-9, 1967.

The Morrisett paper was prepared for a conference organized by the Education Commission of the States. It takes a strong position for keeping politics and education separate, and advocates a "blue-ribbon" leadership role for the State Boards of Education.

Weinstein, Shelly, and Mitchell, Douglas E. "In Education Policy Making, Nearly Everyone is Frustrated." *Compact,* IX (February, 1975), 2-4.

This brief, easily read article presents some views of citizens, legislators, educators and others interested in power and authority in education decision-making. *Compact* is a readable, informative publication of the Education Commission of the States. Contents may be of interest to State Board of Education members.

* The Annotated Bibliography was prepared by Dr. Russell W. Meyers, author of Section II — *Educational Governance.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE
BOARDS OF EDUCATION
810 Lincoln Towers
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203
303/861-0911